

## REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 10-12, 18-19 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,375,161 ("Fuller"). With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner states:

Regarding claim 1, Fuller teaches a method for determining the location of a mobile unit 11 using a telephone number of wireline telephone 14 in the vicinity of said mobile unit 11 (see fig. 1, col 16 lines 6-26) comprising:

receiving at a server 1 said telephone number transmitted from said mobile unit 11 using wireless communication (radio frequency) through a data network 2 (PSTN) (col 16 lines 16-33);

retrieving an address associated with said telephone number in said server 2 (col 16 lines 25-33); and

retrieving a location of said mobile unit 11 based on said address (col 16 lines 25-33).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 1 recites, in pertinent part:

receiving at a server said telephone number transmitted from said mobile unit using wireless communication through a data network;

retrieving an address associated with said telephone number in said server; and

retrieving a location of said mobile unit based on said address.

(emphasis added)

In particular, Applicant's Specification, at page 7, lines 18-21, defines the term "address" to refer to "the identification of a geographical location using information such as the street name, street number, the city and the state." Use of such as address is not part of Fuller's disclosure at Fuller's col. 16, lines 25-33, which merely states:

...example happens to correspond to the phone instrument 14 located in the same room 13. Upon receipt of the ultrasonic signal, the Communicator 11 transmits a brief packet message via radio frequency. This message contains the subscriber's access number and the phone number just received from the ultrasonic transmitter 12. This radio frequency message is detected by packet radio transceiver 9 and passed on to the access control system 1 via data link 10.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Fuller's Figure 1 and column 16, lines 25-33, neither disclose nor suggest the limitation "retrieving an address associated with said telephone number in said server." Similarly, the limitation "retrieving a first address associated with said first telephone number in said server" of Claim 18 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by Fuller. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 18 and their respective dependent Claims 10-12, 19 and 26 are allowable over Fuller. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 10-12, 18-19 and 26 are therefore requested.


The Examiner rejected Claims 2-4, 8-9, 13-17, 20-22, 24-25 and 27-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller in view of U.S. Patent 6,539,080 ("Bruce"). The Examiner relies on Bruce teachings at col. 6, line 60 to col. 7, lines 1-8 and col. 7, lines 40-45 (Claims 2, 6, 21-22, and 27), col. 4, lines 60-67 (Claims 4, and 31), col. 2, lines 57-63 (Claims 8 and 31), Figure 1, (Claim 9), col. 2, lines 35-43 (Claims 13 and 20), col. 2, lines 44-56 (Claims 14-15), col. 5, lines 11-16 (Claims 16-17, 24-25, 29-30, and 33-34), col. 5, lines 1-7 (Claims 28, 32 and 35-38) col. 5, lines 17-21 (Claim 31), and col. 6, lines 1-25 and 55-67 (Claim 31) to teach the additional limitations introduced by Claims 2-4, 8-9, 13-17, 20-22, 24-25 and 27-38. However, none of the above-referenced sections of Bruce disclosure discloses or suggests the "retrieving an address associated with said telephone number in said server" limitation of Claim 1 and the "retrieving a first address associated with said first telephone number in said server" limitation of Claim 18, from which Claims 2-4, 8-9, 13-17, 20-22, 24-25 and 27-38 respectively depend. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-4, 8-9, 13-17, 20-22, 24-25 and 27-38 are each allowable over the combined teachings of Fuller and Bruce. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller, in view of U.S. Patent 6,539,080 ("Kung"). The Examiner relies on Kung to


teach the limitations introduced in Claims 6-7. However, Kung also fails to teach the “retrieving an address associated with said telephone number in said server” limitation of Claim 1 from which Claims 6-7 depend. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 6-7 are each allowable over the combined teachings of Fuller and Kung. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller, in view of Bruce and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0045456 (“Obradovich”). The Examiner relies on Obradovich’s paragraphs 26, 33 and 37 to teach the limitations introduced in Claims 5 and 23. However, paragraphs 26, 33 and 37 of Obradovich also fail to teach the “retrieving an address associated with said telephone number in said server” limitation of Claim 1 or the “retrieving a first address associated with said first telephone number in said server” limitation of Claim 18, from which Claims 5 and 23 respectively depend. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5 and 23 are each allowable over the combined teachings of Fuller, Bruce and Obradovich. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are therefore requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that all pending claims (i.e., Claims 1-38) are each allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants at 408-392-9250.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 6, 2005.	
	1/6/05
Attorney for Applicant(s)	Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

  
Edward C. Kwok  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 33,938

Law Offices of  
MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP  
1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226  
San Jose, CA 95110  
Tel: (408) 392-9250 x208  
Fax: (408) 392-9262

Application No. 09/737,294